



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/176,630	10/22/98	MILLINGTON	J 60.314-054

RANDALL L SHOEMAKER  
HOWARD AND HOWARD  
SUITE 101  
1400 NORTH WOODWARD AVENUE  
BLOOMFIELD HILLS MI 48304-2856

PM82/0629

EXAMINER

LOBO, I

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3662

DATE MAILED: 06/29/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**09/176,630**

Applicant(s)  
**Millington**

Examiner  
**Ian J. Lobo**

Group Art Unit  
**3662**



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2 and 5

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3662

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required if the application is allowed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. Claims 1-15, 18 and 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The instant specification does not describe how the "threshold scale" is determined and the criteria used to ascertain it.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3662

4. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashida et al ('502) when taken in view of Poonsaengsathit et al ('357) or Loughmiller, Jr. et al ('605) .

Hayashida et al discloses a vehicle location display of a navigation system. The system includes a database 38c and display 33 which includes a map at variable scales, i.e, the first, second and third screens are at different scales.

The difference between the instant independent claims and the Hayashida et al patent is the claims specify that the database contains a plurality of road segments having an associated road segment name.

Loughmiller, Jr. et al and Poonsaengsathit et al each teaches that a typical vehicle navigation system display has a digitized map database which includes plural road segments each having a road segment name. Further, note that Loughmiller, Jr. et al teaches that the street prioritization is scale dependent.


In view of Loughmiller, Jr. et al or Poonsaengsathit et al, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to have modified the map database within the system of Hayashida et al by including road segment names to the road segments so as to more clearly detail the location and destination of a vehicle. Claims 1, 16, 24 and 27 are so rejected.

Dependent claims 2-15, 17-23, 25, 26, 28 and 29 are further provided by the combination of the above prior art.

Art Unit: 3662

5. The status of the co-pending applications, noted on pages 2 and 10 of the instant specification, should be updated .

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Ian J. Lobo at telephone number (703) 306-4161.

  
IAN J. LOBO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER